REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 1-25, 30, 31, and 35-37 were rejected. No claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Thus, claims 1-25, 30, 31 and 35-37 are pending.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30, 31 and 35-37 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,370,527 of Singhal (hereinafter "Singhal"). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30, 31 and 35-37 are not anticipated by Singhal.

Singhal describes a meta-search engine device for searching distributed network environments (Singhal, Abstract; Column 2, lines 18-34). To alleviate performing many single searches on many different search engines, a meta-search engine sends search requests to a plurality of search engines and compiles the results (Singhal, Column 2, lines 35-58). The search is performed on storage devices connected to a network, or a combination of networks, where the storage devices "store information and files that may be of interest to a user" (Singhal, Column 3, lines 30-40; Column 4, lines 45-57). The search engine devices return results, which are correlated with each other, ranked, and displayed to a user (Singhal, Column 6, lines 1-28)

With respect to independent claim 1, the Applicants recite:

> A method comprising:
> generating, automatically with an electronic device without user intervention, a private local network search request in response to an original search request, the local network search request to cause a search to be performed on electronic documents stored by a device that is part of a private locate network, the private local network making the documents available to electronic devices belonging to an organization corresponding to the electronic device and not available to remote electronic devices not corresponding to the organization, and wherein one or more of the

> documents are saved in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents and in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents, the search of the electronic documents on the local network to be performed according to search parameters of the original search request;
>
> generating, automatically with the electronic device without having to wait for a search result of the local network search request from the local network and in addition to the local network search request, an external network search request in response to the original search request, the external network search request to cause a search to be performed on electronic documents available from devices that are part of an external public network via a network portal of an external network according to the search parameters of the original search request; and
>
> generating a single search report at the electronic device based on the search results of the private local network search request and the public external network search request.

Thus, Applicants claim in response to a single original search request, generating both a private local network search request of internal documents captured by a private local network without user intervention *and* an external network search request of electronic documents available from devices that are part of an external network via a network portal. Furthermore, the internal private documents are searched by the private local network search request without the private documents being releasing to the network portals of external networks. The results of the local network search and the external network search are then presented as a single search report. Singhal fails to describe or suggest the limitations recited in claim 1:

> [G]enerating, automatically ... a private local network search request in response to an original search request ... on electronic documents stored by a device that is part of a private locate network, the private local network making the documents available to electronic devices belonging to an organization corresponding to the electronic device and not available to remote electronic devices not corresponding to the organization, and wherein one or more of the documents are saved in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents and in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents ...

As claimed by the Applicants, the documents included in the search of the private local network include "unconsciously captured documents," or those documents that do not require explicit actions of a user to save documents (*See, for example,* Specification, page 9, line 19 to page 10, lien 4; page 11, line 3 to page 12, line 3). Although Singhal describes performing a search on various storage devices connected to a network, Singhal fails to further discuss the functional capabilities of these storage devices, or the properties and nature of the documents stored on those devices. Rather, Singhal merely states:

> The network 120 may include a plurality of storage devices (not shown) which store information and files that may be of interest to a user of the user device 100. The information and files stored on these storage devices may be located by using any one or more of the search engine devices 140-160 connected to the network 120. Therefore, Singhal cannot anticipate the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

(Singhal, column 3, lines 30-35). Stating that searching storage devices connected to a variety of networks that "store information and files that may be of interest to a user," however, fails to describe or suggest generating both of a private local network search request of documents captured by a private local network without user intervention and an external network search request of electronic documents available from devices that are part of an external network via a network portal.

The Examiner asserted that Singhal describes that the meta-search queries search private documents captured by a local network without intervention of a user (Final Office Action, page 3 *citing* Singhal column 3, lines 30-46). In the passage of Singhal cited by the Examiner, Singhal recites that the "network 120 may include a plurality of storage devices (not shown) which store information and files that may be of interest to a

user of the user device 100. The information and files stored on these storage devices may be located by using any one or more of the search engine devices 140-160 connected to the network 120." Searching documents that "may be of interest to a user," however, fails to describe or suggest searching documents captured by a local network without the intervention of a user. Other than general references to network types (*See* Singhal, Column 3, lines 8-29), Singhal fails to further describe the properties and functioning of those networks, and the storage devices included in those networks.

The Examiner further asserts that Singhal describes performing a search on documents that are part of a private local area network, and which are not available to electronic devices outside of the organization corresponding to the private local area network (*See* Office Action, page 3, paragraph 4; page 11, paragraph 7 to page 12, paragraph 8). More precisely, the examiner asserts that because Sinhal describes performing searches on multiple network, or combinations of networks, including intranets, then Singhal inherently discloses searching documents on a private local network without making those documents available to remote electronic devices (Office Action, Page 11, paragraph 7 *citing* FOLDOC's definition of an "intranet"). The Applicants disagree, and respectfully submit that Singhal in fact discloses the opposite. Singhal describes a system in which any user device capable of connecting to a network may send the meta-search engine a search request, which causes a search to be performed on all search engine devices connected to the network (*See* Singhal, column 3, lines 46-53). Because Singhal states that any user device capable of connecting to the network is able of request a search via the meta-search engine, even when the network consists of a combination of network, then each search opens the content of the entire network, or

combination of networks, to each device on the network. That is, if Singhal's meta-search engine is connected to an intranet and an external network, such as the internet or a WAN (*See* Final Office Action, page 3 to 4), then users that connect to the external portion of the network that request searches via the meta-search engine cause searches to be performed on the intranet. Then logically, since Singhal is completely silent as to restricting the meta-search engine search requests, user devices connected to the internet/WAN portion of the network of Singhal would be able to search the purportedly private content of the internet. Thus, Singhal discloses a search engine method and apparatus that opens up the content of an intranet when combined with external network searches. The Applicants, however, claim both searching public content *and* searching private local content without releasing the content to devices outside of an organization.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the Applicants submit that Singhal fails to disclose the elements claimed by the Applicants, and fails to anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12 depend from claim 1. Claims 14-19, 21, 22 and 24 depend from claim 13. Claims 30, 31 and 35-37 depend from claim 25. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31 and 35-37 are not anticipated by Singhal for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 11 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Singhal in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,040 of Rakavy, et al (hereinafter "Rakavy"). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that neither Singhal nor Rakavy, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 11 and 23.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and claim 23 depends from claim 13. Rakavy is cited to teach a search report having an advertisement selected based on the search results (Final Office Action, page 8, mailed July 18, 2006). However, whether or not Rakavy discloses the selection of advertisements, Rakavy does not cure the deficiencies of Singhal set forth above. Therefore, neither Singhal nor Rakavy, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 11 and 23.

Claims 8 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Singhal in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,332 of Nasr, et al (hereinafter "Nasr"). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that neither Singhal nor Nasr, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 8 and 20.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 13. Nasr is cited to teach a search report as either HTML or XML (Final Office Action, page 9, mailed July 18, 2006). However, whether or not Nasr discloses HTML and/or XML search results, Nasr does not cure the deficiencies of Singhal set forth above. Therefore, no combination of Singhal and Nasr can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 8 and 20.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-25, 30, 31 and 35-37 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 9/18/06

Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
(Reg. No. 36,591)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300